

### **REMARKS**

Claims 5-12 are pending in the present application. Claim 8 remains allowed. Claims 11 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten to specify their dependence from Claim 8. Claims 5, 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being upatentable over Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,082, in view of Kohl, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031026. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being upatentable over Lo et al. in view of Kohl et al. in further view of Siu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,528,215. Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being upatentable over Lo et al. in view of Kohl et al. in further view of Gulick et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,058,443.

Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to specify their dependence from Claim 8. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

#### **Objection to the claims**

Claims 11 and 12 were objected to for the informality of not referring to a specific claim number from which these claims depend. These claims refer to the method for serial synchronous data transmission, which corresponds to claim 8. However, claims 11 and 12 did not numerically specify claim 8. Claims 11 and 12 have now been amended to specify that they depend from Claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 11 and 12 is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lo and Kohl**

Claims 5, 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being upatentable over Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,082, in view of Kohl et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031026.

Lo describes computer subsystems 100a and 100b using interface circuits 110a and 110b and a message bus 150. See col. 4, lines 50-54, and Fig. 2. Interface circuit 110a receives an acknowledge signal (AQ) over line 126 from clock domain 2 of computer subsystem 100b. See col. 5, lines 64-67.

Kohl describes utilizing a third state for transmitting a synchronization signal over a single data line that also carries a high state or a low state to transmit information. See abstract and pg. 1, para 3.

Independent claim 5 of the present application recites “the master and slave interfaces are capable of being connected via at least one data transmission line” and “the master and the slave interfaces are capable of being connected via a acknowledgment signal line configured for a transmission of an acknowledgment signal from the slave device to the master device.”

It is respectfully submitted that Lo and Kohl do not teach or suggest these features of claim 5. The OA admits that Lo does not disclose or suggest the claim limitation that the master and slave interfaces are capable of being connected via at least one data transmission line. Instead, the OA indicates that Kohl discloses this limitation. Specifically, the OA cites paragraph 18 and Figure 1 of Kohl, which discloses a transmission line 15 between an interface 2 and an interface 3. The OA then concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the teaching of Kohl in the system of Lo to reduce the amount of processing for the devices, thus providing better efficiency in the devices. Applicant respectfully disagrees. To combine Kohl with Lo as the OA proposes, would result in connecting a transmission line between interfaces 110a and 110b of Lo. This would not result in any reduction in the amount of processing, and would not improve efficiency. Lo already teaches a message bus 150 that is connected directly between computer subsystems 100a and 100b. This direct connection is more efficient than a connection that must pass through the interfaces 110a and 110b. One of ordinary skill would not be motivated to use Kohl with Lo.

The OA also indicates that Lo discloses the claim limitation that the master and slave interfaces are capable of being connected via an acknowledgement signal configured for a transmission of an acknowledgement signal from the slave device to the master device. The OA refers to col. 2, lines 26-27 of Lo. The cited portion of Lo refers to an acknowledgment signal “AQ” shown in Figure 1B. However, Lo explains that Figure 1B corresponds to prior art that is not equivalent to Lo’s invention, which is shown in Figure 2. See col. 2, lines 45-50. The “AQ” signal of Figure 1B is not disclosed as connected between master and slave interfaces of Lo’s

invention in Figure 2. The OA cites interfaces 110a and 110b of Figure 2, but Lo does not disclose or suggest any connection between these master and slave interfaces.

Further, the OA indicates that Lo discloses a clock signal line between the master and slave. The OA cites element 124 of Figure 2. However, the limitation is that the master and slave *interfaces* are capable of being connected via one data transmission line and a clock signal line. Lo does not disclose or suggest a clock signal line connecting interfaces 110a and 110b. Moreover, a fundamental purpose of Lo is “for providing handshaking signals between subsystem domains having different clock rates.” Col. 2, lines 63-66. Lo discloses “a) a master domain having a master clock signal; b) a slave domain having a slave clock signal that is different in frequency than the master clock signal . . .” Col. 3, lines 49-52. Figure 2 of Lo shows two separate clock signal lines, CLK1 (124) and CLK2 (138), neither of which connects interfaces 110a and 110b. Thus, Lo does not disclose or suggest another limitation of independent claim 5.

Because each of Lo and Kohl is missing at least the above-recited features of independent claim 5, any combination of these references, to the extent proper, could not render claim 5 or any of its dependent claims obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Lo in view of Kohl. It is well established that dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend. According, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Lo in view of Kohl.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lo, Kohl, and Sui

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al. in view of Kohl et al. in further view of Siu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,528,215.

Siu describes a building automation system using complementary modules, one of which is an expansion module. See abstract. However, Siu does not disclose or suggest the limitations discussed above that are missing from Lo and Kohl. Also claim 7 depends from independent claim 5, which is patentable for at the reasons discussed above. According, Applicant

respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Lo in view of Kohl and Siu.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lo, Kohl, and Gulick

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al. in view of Kohl et al. in further view of Gulick, U.S. Patent No. 6,058,443.

Gulick describes a system in which data is transferred between first and second integrated circuits in frames which includes a predetermined number of data bits and preassigned slots for the states of the input and output signals, so as to continuously transfer the state of the input and output signals to and from the input and output pins of the second integrated circuit at a predetermined rate. See abstract. Gulick's use of a predetermined rate is fundamentally opposite of Applicant's invention that uses an acknowledgment signal to control transfer data. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to consider Gulick. In any case, Gulick does not disclose or suggest the limitations discussed above that are missing from Lo and Kohl. Also claims 9 and 10 depend from independent claim 5, which is patentable for at the reasons discussed above. According, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Lo in view of Kohl and Gulick.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at the number below.

Dated: June 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_/ERS/\_\_\_\_\_

Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Customer No. 07278